

Chittenden County Court.
May Term, 1934.

In Smith v. Hally and Truett, the plaintiff's day's report was a verdict for the plaintiff. Whitehead v. V. C. R. R. Co. Action commenced for negligently constructing a culvert, the plaintiff was not experienced. Verdict for plaintiff. Mack, Smalley and Hill for the plaintiff. Phelps & Chittenden for the defendant.

James v. Briggs, Accountant on promissory note. The case was continued on trial, to await the result of the relating to the venue move.

Mr. Maynard, and Mr. French for the plaintiff. Mr. Briggs and Mr. French for the defendant.

Field & Co. v. Sherman, Action for not keeping property attached. Phelps & Chittenden and Edmunds for the plaintiff. Mr. March and Butler for the defendant.

No other jury cases will be tried until Monday when Judge Peck will continue the business.

Last evening Chancellor Peck decided the contempt case. The motion for commitment was granted.

James Campbell, A. Burton, Henry R. Campbell, La-
ter White, Elsie Root, David A. Smalley, John
Campbell, W. H. Flegg, and J. C. Bahner,
inasmuch of an injunction granted in the case of
A. Platt v. The B. & R. R. Co., Ch. Tr.
Oscar A. Burton, Henry R. Campbell, La-
White, and Elsie Root. The injunction was
by the Clerk of the Court, upon an order in fa-
ther purpose made by the Chancellor, but it di-
rected or refer to such order, or in terms state
the Chancellor had ordered an injunction. The
injunction commanded the defendants, their

After the service of the injunction upon the defendants except Campbell, who was absent, the boat was taken and kept from the orators by violence.

The Chancellor decided that H. R. Campbell was not guilty, as he was absent when the affair occurred, and did not affirm it when it came to his knowledge—that Flagg and Babbitt were not to have participated in the breach—that the action was valid and regular, and that it was not a breach of it, to disturb the possession of the tortors under a repeal—in that John D. Campbell was a writer in favor of H. R. Campbell against the agents of the tortors in possession of the Salvus was blockaded at the Harbor, by two other steamers outside of her, under a threat that the injunction was void on its face; and that if valid it did not restrain the bringing of a vessel in.

alternatives of the existence; and that the Mr. Smalley, in going beyond the mere giving of opinion as counsel as to its infirmity, and advice as to breach, could not be justified in his course. It was said that he was not a lawyer.

It was ordered that the respondents restore the blockade and restore the boat to the orators forty-eight hours, and pay the damages caused by the breach, and the costs of this proceeding. The respondents moved for an appeal, but the Court estimated his doubt whether an appeal could be taken, and the same is not yet allowed. The stand-over until the 20th instant, for a Motion report of the damage and costs.

MONDAY MAY 11.

Mr. W. W. Wier, Mr. J. W. Wier, Mr. C. and Mr. Edmunds, for the Orators; Mr. S. B. Maack, and Phelps and Childrean, for the respondents.

The Jury Income was again returned, Peck presiding.

Taylor & Rhodes & Bishop was tried in pe

complaints while they were not yet taken to the court. The case was then referred to Mr. Edwards and Phelps A. Chittenden for the plaintiff, and Messrs. Underwood and Hard, for the defendants.

Testes, May 10.

The jury in Taylor v. Rhodes A. Bishop, charged, but they had not returned a verdict at noon.

Bastien v. Essex, was next taken up and a verdict not yet in. Mr. Maynard and Mr. E. E. Taylor for plaintiff, Mr. Steek for defendant.

Additional Items of Foreign News.

TURKEY AND RUSSIA.—The *Journal of Constantinople* of the 25th ult. contains the following account of the late Russian declaration from the Emperor to his subjects, in which he represents the war against E. R. as undertaken for the purpose of liberating Asia Minor and France, as one undertaken in defence of

[illegible]

The Siege of Silistria.

Accounts from Bucharest, April 19th, state that Silistria had been hard pressed the 14th, and would ere then have fallen for the determined valor of its defenders expressed themselves able to hold on

The Russians were expected to assault the 1st of May, with 30 thousand men. They have erected 17 heavy batteries, and most of which they will cross the river. The message at Oltenitz is expected at that time.

Notwithstanding all these formidable means we must not forget that Silistra is a strong place to be carried without blood and severe struggle.

The Russians, on the contrary, expect to reduce the place in a few days.

The Baltic Fleet.

The British fleet had been further forced, and was awaiting the arrival of the French squadron.

On the 21st, 19 British ships anchored before Stockholm. Napier arrived on the 22nd.

A letter from an officer of the fleet tells the following good story: one morning, five days since we saw a large vessel miles ahead, which we fully believed

As we rapidly came up with her she
sail until she was under reefed top-tail
beat to quarters and the pipe sounded
bring the ship into action." Five
minutes everything was trouble, our
guns loose, elevating the decks, a
minutes more and every gun was sho
primed, and the men standing v
match-lines in their hands, waiting
word to fire.

It is rumored that the Austro-Treaty, although concluded, has not been ratified, and apprehensions are expressed that the Russian party at Berlin should be successful in persuading the King to refuse his assent to the treaty. In Baron Manteuffel's speech, how-

the closing of the Chamber, he said supplies just voted had enabled the Government to proceed on the course hitherto pursued. In perfect union Austria, and in unison with the Powers, the King would direct all efforts to restore peace, and to obtain safety for the future.

☛ Among the patents issued by the U. S. Patent office under date of 1834, is one to James Rogers, of Vt., for improved machine for making each.